

United States Patent and Trademark Office

CUL____

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/848,259 | 05/04/2001 | Daniel R. Jeske | 2925-0575P | 6336 |
| 30594 7590 05/30/2007 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | AGHDAM, FRESHTEH N | |
| RESTON, VA 20195 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2611 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | · | 05/30/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 09/848,259 | JESKE ET AL. | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | |
| | Freshteh N. Aghdam | 2611 | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | _ | 1 | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS , cause the application to become ABAND | FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 Fe | ebruary 2007. | | | | |
| | action is non-final. | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E | Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11 | I, 453 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,3 and 5</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) <u>2 and 4</u> is/are objected to. | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | r election requirement. | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine | ır | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc | | he Examiner | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct | | • • | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | · -· · | • | | | |
| | · | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11 | 9(a)-(d) or (f). | | | |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority document | | ication No | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority document3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority | | | | | |
| application from the International Burea | | served in this realional Stage | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | , | eived. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | |
| 1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | mary (PTO-413) | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | | ail Date mal Patent Application | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | • • | | | |

Application/Control Number: 09/848,259

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Examiner of record has changed to Freshteh N Aghdam. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raheli et al (US 6,389,079), and further in view of Milan et al (US 2006/0117127).

As to claims 1 and 3, Raheli discloses a method of and/ or apparatus for estimating signal to noise ratio includes converting the received plurality of data symbol samples into plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples in a differential receiver by performing differential decoding and utilizing phase shift keying modulation method; and generating a SNR estimate based on the plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples (e.g. based on the result of differential decoding; Col. 2, lines 20-23). Raheli does not expressly disclose converting the received plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples based on the estimated polarities of the received data symbol samples; and estimating the

SNR value such that the SNR estimate is not dependent only on the polarities of the plurality of received data symbol samples. Milan discloses a differential receiver that estimates the polarities of the received symbols samples (Fig. 3, (94)) and based on the estimation result performs differential decoding (Fig. 3, (98)) and since differential decoding is dependent on both the BPSK demodulated received signal and the delayed BPSK demodulated signal; therefore, the SNR estimate is not dependent only on the polarities of the plurality of received data symbol samples. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that it is obvious to estimate SNR instead of SINR when noise is considered channel noise plus interference noise. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Milan with Raheli in order to resolve phase ambiguity of the data signal by employing differential detection in addition to BPSK demodulation.

As to claim 5, Raheli discloses a method of and/ or apparatus for estimating signal to noise ratio includes converting the received plurality of data symbol samples into plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples in a differential receiver by performing differential decoding and utilizing phase shift keying modulation method; and generating a SNR estimate based on the plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples (e.g. based on the result of differential decoding; Col. 2, lines 20-23). Raheli does not expressly disclose converting the received plurality of quasi-pilot symbol samples based on the estimated polarities of the received data symbol samples. Milan discloses a differential receiver that estimates the polarities of the received symbols samples (Fig. 3, (94)) and based on the estimation result performs differential decoding (Fig. 3, (98)). One of ordinary skill

in the art would recognize that it is obvious to estimate SNR instead of SINR when noise is considered channel noise plus interference noise. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Milan with Raheli in order to resolve phase ambiguity of the data signal by employing differential detection in addition to BPSK demodulation.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Freshteh N. Aghdam whose telephone number is 571-272-6037. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on 571-272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2611

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Freshteh Aghdam Examiner

Art Unit 2611

May 24, 2007

KEVIN BURD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Min M Bud